

REMARKS

Additional sheets containing a clean copy of the amended claims accompany this amendment.

The previous Figures 1, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, 6a, 6b, 6c, 7a, 7b, 7c, 8a, 8b, 8c, 8d, 9, 10, 11a, 11b, 12, 13, 14a, 14b and 14c have been replaced with present Figures 1, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, 6a, 6b, 6c, 7a, 7b, 7c, 8a, 8b, 8c, 8d, 9, 10, 11a, 11b, 12, 13, 14a, 14b and 14c. No amendments have been made to the Figures. Rather, the Figures have been reformatted such the reference numerals are of larger print and at least 1/8" in size in order to address the Draftsperson's objections. It is respectfully submitted that the present drawings overcome the Draftsperson's objections. It is also noted that the present drawings are based on the original drawings which were found acceptable under the International Patent Cooperation Treaty. Nevertheless, should the Draftsperson maintain the objection to the drawings, further formal drawings can be prepared upon allowance of the case.

The claims have been amended to more clearly and explicitly define the present invention. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite the subject matter previously recited in claim 20, which is now being cancelled. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to more clearly recite the feature that "said remote conferee located remotely from said group meeting". Claim 1 has also been amended to recite that the "control means mounted on the base for moving the video monitor and video camera in response to an input control signal derived from a remote signal generated by the remote conferee"

Claim 6 has been amended to recite that the control signal is optionally derived from sound source detection means so as to reflect that the sound source detection means is now an optional further input to the input control signal being derived from a remote signal generated by the remote conferee, recited in amended claim 1.

In addition, new independent claim 21 has been submitted for consideration by the Examiner. New claim 21 is similar in scope to present amended claim 1, but does not explicitly recite the video camera is mounted to the base and movable therewith.

In view of the cancellation of previous claim 20, the total number of claims remains as 20 and therefore no additional claims fees are required.

The Examiner has objected to previous claim 1 as being obvious in view of Okaya and the Hildin references. The Examiner has also objected to previous claim 20, which is now being incorporated into claim 1, as being obvious in view of Okaya (U.S. Patent 5,808,663) and Hildin (U.S. Patent 5,844,599). The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objection to the present claims in view of the amendments to claim 1, and at least for the following reasons.

The Examiner has stated in the Examiner's Report that "Okaya differs from the claimed invention not specifically teaching control means mounted on the base for moving the video monitor and video camera in response to an input control signal so that the video monitor and video camera move in response to the input control signal". The Examiner's indication that Okaya does not teach this feature is acknowledged, with thanks.

The Examiner goes on to state the Hildin reference "teaches a voice following video system for capturing the view of speaker comprising a position control system, i.e., control means, mounted on the base as shown in Figure 5 for moving video camera so that the video camera moves in response to control signal (column 2, lines 39 to 53) in order to automatically reposition the video camera for capturing the view of the active speaker. Note while Okaya teaches the video camera and the video monitor are within the media unit (column 2, lines 53 to 56). By combining Okaya and Hildin, the control means can move the video camera, as well as the video monitor, in response to the input control signal".

However, it is respectfully submitted that neither Okaya nor Hildin teach, suggest or disclose that the input control signal to move the video monitor and video camera can be "derived from a remote signal generated by the remote conferee". It is respectfully submitted that this

feature, which was recited in previous claim 20 and has now been incorporated into amended claim 1. With respect to previous claim 20, the Examiner stated that Hildin discloses this feature at column 4, line 65 to column 5, line 19. However, it is respectfully submitted that neither this portion of Hildin, nor Hildin in any other location, teaches, suggests or discloses that the control signal used to move the video monitor can be derived from a remote signal generated by the remote conferee. Rather, Hildin “relates to voice-following video systems which dynamically follow the active speaker among a group of individuals” as stated at column 1, lines 10 to 12 of Hildin. Hildin also clearly states that it relates to “a voice-following video systems for dynamically tracking an active speaker. This system includes a video camera, a position control system for the video camera, and one or more voice-activated emitters. The video camera is mechanically and electrically coupled to the position control system.” [see Hildin, column 2, lines 29 to 34]. With respect to this specific portion objected to by the Examiner, it is respectfully submitted that Hildin states that “When audio detector 300 receives voice energy that exceeds a predetermined threshold, audio detector 300 produces an ACTIVE signal 301. For the duration of time that the participant talks about the threshold, ACTIVE signal 301 is maintained.” [see Hildin, column 5, lines 4 to 8]. Hildin goes on to state that “In response to ACTIVE signal 301, transmitter 302 emits a POSITION signal 303. In this preferred embodiment, POSITION signal 303 is an IR signal. Since POSITION signal 303 emits from the location of the active speaker, it acts as a beacon for position control system 106 to locate and track the active speaker. [see Hildin column 5, lines 9 to 14].

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Hildin throughout refers to a voice-following video system for dynamically capturing and viewing the active speaker. Hildin also discloses that the signal which moves the camera can be derived from an audio detector 300. However, Hildin does not teach, suggest or disclose that the input control signal can be derived from a remote signal generated by the remote conferee. In other words, all of the signals generated by Hildin to move the camera are generated by people located within the room and, in particular, an audio detector based on the voice energy of people in the room. Hildin does not teach, suggest or disclose that a remote conferee located outside of the room can send a remote signal into the room which can then be used to move the video monitor and video camera. Furthermore, Hildin does not teach, suggest or disclose that the remote conferee can send a signal

to move the video monitor and video camera in order to enable a remote conferee to project a sense of presence into the group meeting for instance by moving the monitor to face one of the conferees in the group meeting. In this system disclosed by Hildin, the conferees remote from the group meeting can not cause any movement of the video monitor and video camera and the system.

It is respectfully submitted that the neither Okaya nor Hildin teach that the video monitor moves in response to the input control signal “derived from a remote signal generated by he remote conferee” as recited in present claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that the remote conferee is referred to throughout the application as being the video conferee which is not present in the room, but rather is remote from the other conferees, and is teleconferencing with the people in he room. Furthermore, claim 1 has been amended to more clearly and explicitly defines that “said remote conferee located remotely from said group meeting”. As such, amended claim 1 does not relate to an audio detector which receives voice energy from a conferee within the room to “locate and track the active speaker”, as disclosed by Hildin at column 4, line 65 to column 5, line 19. Rather, the present invention relates to permitting the remote conferee which is located remotely from the group meeting, to project a sense of presence into the group by moving the video monitor. Amended claim 1 recites a teleconferencing robot “for enabling a remote conferee to project a sense of presence into a group meeting, said remote conferee located remotely from said group meeting, the teleconferencing robot comprising” amongst other things “control means mounted on the base for moving the video monitor and video camera in response to an input control signal derived from a remote signal generated by the remote conferee” and “wherein said video monitor and video camera move in response to said input control signal to enable the remote conferee to project a sense of presence into the group meeting”.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Okaya nor Hildin teach or disclose any means for the remote conferee to move the video monitor in the room to enable the remote conferee to project a sense of presence into the group meeting. At best, Hildin teaches a voice tracking system which tracks one of the participants in the room and have the monitor move to that participant. This is not related in anyway to the present invention which relates to having the video monitor

move in response to an input control signal derived from a remote signal generated by the remote conferee who is located remotely from the group meeting.

Furthermore, neither Hildin nor Okaya teach or disclose the advantages of the present invention as disclosed in more detail on pages 2 and 3 of the disclosure. For instance, neither Okaya nor Hildin teach or disclose that permitting the remote conferee located remotely from the group meeting to control movement of the video monitor, provides an advantage as follows:

“To transform the television into a more dynamic, interactive device a substantially life-sized image of a remote conferee’s face is displayed on a television or video monitor and the television or video monitor is controlled to swivel left or right to create the impression that the remote conferee is turning his or her head to look at a person speaking.” [emphasis added, see page 2, line 15 of the disclosure]

In view of the above reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objections to present claim 1 being obvious in view of Okaya and Hildin. As to the remaining claims objected to by the Examiner, namely present claims 2 to 19, as these claims are directly or indirectly dependent from claim 1, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objections with respect to all of the dependent claims 2 to 19 at least for the same reasons as stated above with respect to claim 1. Likewise, new claim 21 recites subject matter similar to amended claim 1 and, in particular, recites that the remote conferee is located remotely from the group meeting but that the monitor can move “in response to an input control signal derived from a remote signal generated by the remote conferee”, to project a sense of presence into the group meeting. Therefore, new claim 21 recites patentably distinguishable subject matter in view of the prior at least for the same reasons as stated above with respect to claim 1.

It is submitted that the foregoing amendments are such as to comply with the formal matters raised in the Official Action and this application is in a condition for allowance.

If for any reason the Examiner is of the view that this application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at 1-416-961-

5000 so that an interview or telephone conference may be arranged to expedite allowance of this case.

It is hereby petitioned under 37 CFR 1-1336 that the response term of this application be extended, if necessary, to a date which would include the filing date of the present amendment and the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any necessary extension fee to deposit account no. 18-1350, under an order number corresponding to attorney docket number P150299.

Favourable consideration and disposition is respectfully requested.

Respectfully requested

**SMITH, Graham Thomas and FELS, Deborah
Ingrid and TREVIRANUS, Jutta**

By: 

Jeffrey Pervanas
Reg. No. 41,543

JP/sll
Encls.
Ret. Ack. Card
Clean copy of amended claims 1 and 6
New Figures 1, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5,
6a, 6b, 6c, 7a, 7b, 7c, 8a, 8b, 8c, 8d, 9, 10,
11a, 11b, 12, 13, 14a, 14b and 14c

Riches, McKenzie & Herbert LLP
Suite 1800, 2 Bloor Street East
Toronto, Ontario M4W 3J5
Canada
Tel.: (416) 961-5000
Fax: (416) 961-5081